

1 REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

2 City Council Chambers

3 300 Park Avenue

4 Falls Church, Virginia 22046

5 June 16, 2016

6 7:30 p.m.

7 1. CALL TO ORDER

8 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: I would like to call to order the June 16,
9 2016, meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals of the City of Falls
10 Church.

11 Roll call.

12
13 2. ROLL CALL

14 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Williamson.

15 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Here.

16 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Krasner.

17 MR. KRASNER: Here.

18 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Calabrese is absent.

19 Mr. Howell.

20 MR. HOWELL: Here.

21 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Theologis.

22 MR. THEOLOGIS: Here.

23

24 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: I'm going to move Items 5, Petitions,
25 and Item 6, New Business, ahead of Item 3, Approval of Minutes on the
26 agenda that we have posted.

27

28 5. PETITIONS

29 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: First of all, are there any petitions from
30 the audience this evening?

31 Seeing none, we'll move on to the next item which is New
32 Business.

33

34 6. NEW BUSINESS

35 A. Variance application V-1581-16 by Corey Joseph Poole,
36 owner and applicant, for a variance to Section 48-238(3)(a) to allow
37 a front yard setback of twenty one point four (21.4) feet instead of
38 thirty (30) feet along the Ann Street frontage for the purpose of
39 constructing an addition on premises known as 605 Jackson Street, RPC
40 #52-601-016 of the Falls Church Real Property Records, zoned R-1A Low
41 Density Residential.

42 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: That would be, the first order of New

43 Business is Variance Application V-1581-16 by Corey Joseph Poole,
44 owner and applicant, for a variance to Section 48-238(3)(a) to allow
45 a front yard setback of twenty one point four (21.4) feet instead of
46 thirty (30) feet along the Ann Street frontage for the purpose of
47 constructing an addition on premises known as 605 Jackson Street, RPC
48 #52-601-016 of the Falls Church Real Property Records, zoned R-1A
49 Low Density Residential.

50 If I could just ask that if anyone is going to speak on
51 this matter or any matter tonight, if you are going to speak, please
52 raise your right hand and be sworn in.

53 (Witness sworn.)

54 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: And before we hear from the applicant,
55 we'll just get a brief report from staff on this matter.

56 John.

57 MR. BOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

58 First, I'd like to thank the Board and the applicants for
59 their patience. We had a glitch on the part of the advertising done
60 by the newspaper and what was scheduled for last month had to be
61 continued over. Highly unusual, newspaper sends its apologies. And
62 when that happens, we're obligated to readvertise and continue, so
63 both these matters tonight were carried forward to tonight.

64 The matter before you now is a Variance to a residential
65 property, a corner lot. I think you'll hear from the applicant based
66 on the materials he submitted to the Board; you should have a plat of
67 the property including showing the proposed footprint; and terrain
68 lines, elevation lines of the property showing the lay of the land
69 there as well as the location of a retaining wall; several
70 photographs of the property and some architectural drawings of the proposed
71 addition.

72 What's interesting about this corner lot which is a
73 circumstance the Board sees quite frequently, houses located on
74 corner lots come before this Board often for Variances usually
75 because the house was built to the previous setback which was the
76 standard 25, 30 feet off of one street and then the other street
77 frontage would be half of the neighbors' typically, 15 feet or even
78 less.

79 When this house was constructed, those setbacks were in
80 force, however the builder at that time in the 40s, early 50s, opted
81 to position the house where you see it on the plat, I think a lot of
82 that had to do with the terrain.

83 But something for this Board to consider is what the
84 applicant is asking for, while it is not within staff's authority to

85 grant, I think it is consistent with what we've considered before,
86 and would be consistent with the setback that was there when the
87 house was constructed.

88 And with that, I think I'll defer to the applicant and
89 their presentation.

90 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Any clarifying questions or should we
91 proceed with the applicant?

92 MR. KRASNER: Just one quick question for Mr. Boyle.

93 So just to confirm, so the setback, the front yard setback
94 on Ann Street, the applicant represents 30 feet in his letter. Is
95 that the correct setback per the Ordinance?

96 MR. BOYLE: That's correct. From the property line.

97 MR. KRASNER: So the proposal that he's proposing, a
98 setback of 21.4, so that's --

99 MR. BOYLE: Correct. And we arrived at that specific
100 number based on the addition, the size of the addition, results in
101 that remainder.

102 MR. KRASNER: So is that just an encroachment of 9.6 feet?

103 MR. BOYLE: 8.6.

104 MR. KRASNER: 8.6. Okay. Just to clarify, since the
105 letter was referencing the curb, you don't measure from the curb, you

106 measure from the property line.

107 MR. BOYLE: That's correct.

108 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. Thank you.

109 Would you state your name and proceed.

110 MR. POOLE: It's Corey Joseph Poole, 605 West Jackson
111 Street. Thank you, Mr. Boyle.

112 To go on with what you were saying, usually the setback is
113 from the outside of the curb but since the City owns 4 1/2 feet of
114 the inside of the curb, which is the grassy area, my setback is way
115 larger. So I'm asking for, like you said, 8.6 feet of Variance.

116 So one of the hardships that we have is that the property
117 raises 6 feet, you see in the first photo where my son is riding
118 across the lawn, that it raises significant so it would be vary hard
119 for us to build off the back. We would have to basically start it
120 halfway through the first level to the second level.

121 We are also only asking for 11 1/2 feet, the reason being
122 is the self-imposed hardship, which we have three kids and they're
123 crazy, under 5 years old. Our house basically, just one side, you
124 can see a couple of photos I have, from the back and per my wife
125 didn't want me to put them in there but I did anyway, we have
126 basically a long highway.

127 So we wanted to basically build an addition off the sides,
128 put a kitchen into the side, open up the area around it.

129 Now, I took some photographs of various houses that do have
130 similar additions on the side. I do not know if they have that 4 1/2
131 foot which the City owns from the iron pin which is the City -- which
132 is our property line but they're well within the 30 foot setback.

133 The first sets of photos you can see that -- you see
134 basically the raise in elevation. Plus I went out and drew a
135 topography where the back of our house to the back of the property
136 raises 9 feet.

137 So, we're looking to build off to the side so we can gain
138 more area to our house.

139 We also wanted to build a house, and you can see in the
140 architectural, that looks like a house that was designed to be
141 originally built and not just added on in different ways and that
142 will -- we're looking to beautify. We're very invested in this
143 community and we wanted to help beautify our home and help beautify
144 the properties around it.

145 And then I went out and got signatures. There's no protest
146 from my neighbors. They all agree on what I propose to do.

147 So basically I'm asking for 8.6 feet of additional Variance

148 so we can build an 11 1/2 feet addition. Which also, if the City
149 didn't own part of the property and we did go to the outside of the
150 curb, does fall within, under 30 feet of the curb. It falls in
151 within half a foot underneath the outside of the curb, if we were to
152 follow that 30 setback from the outside the curb. But since my
153 property line is 4 foot inside the sidewalk, I'm dealing with almost
154 40 foot of setback than most people in the City.

155 If you look at the drawings, it is a one level addition.
156 It is a very small addition. It's basically so we can put a kitchen
157 in it and a dining room table and open up the inside of the house so
158 the kids eventually don't kill me.

159 Does anybody have any questions so far?

160 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Yeah, we can see if we have any
161 questions.

162 Any questions for the applicant?

163 MR. KRASNER: Just a few questions.

164 So, are you doing any other improvements to the house other than the
165 addition?

166 MR. POOLE: Yes, we're doing a -- there was a, when we
167 bought the house, when we purchased the house if you look at the
168 plat, there was a little addition put off, was built in the back

169 before we purchased the house.

170 What we're doing, we're just finishing the back of the
171 house, just going straight across the back. And that's where we're
172 going to put a playroom and extend the small bedroom into a master
173 bedroom.

174 MR. KRASNER: Right, because I think you mentioned in your
175 letter, that the current square footage for the house is
176 approximately 1400 square feet and that's including the upper floor
177 as well.

178 Including the addition, how many square feet?

179 MR. POOLE: I'm sorry. I did not calculate that.

180 The one for the Variance or the one for the back of the
181 house?

182 MR. KRASNER: How large is the proposed addition on the Ann
183 Street side?

184 MR. POOLE: Oh, it's 11 1/2 by 22.5.

185 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: So it's 258.75 square feet.

186 MR. KRASNER: Right. So it's a relatively modest addition
187 to the house that is by most standards in Falls Church, it's a
188 smaller house.

189 And obviously looking at, I drove by the front of your

190 house, and the rear yard clearly has a grade.

191 And so I know you mentioned this in your letter, just to
192 get it on the record, you obviously -- the back yard is deep and
193 narrow but the grade is significant. So I think if you were
194 intending to build in the rear yard, would that pose any difficulties
195 for you, to try to build it by-right in the rear yard? I'm sure you
196 looked at that.

197 MR. POOLE: Yeah. We would have to do a major excavation
198 and then we would -- not only to the back of the house, we would have
199 to -- significant excavation and grading projects. Plus if I
200 remember correctly, you would have to do retaining walls at 2 foot
201 and setback at 2 foot. So if we dug out the back yard, we would
202 essentially lose --

203 MR. KRASNER: It would be a lot of --

204 MR. POOLE: A lot of disturbance.

205 MR. KRASNER: Your house today is kind of at the base of
206 that slope. There's no flat area to the rear of your house within
207 the setback.

208 MR. POOLE: No.

209 MR. KRASNER: Just one last question. I did see a nice, it
210 looks like it's a maple tree. Is that tree going to be removed for

211 this addition?

212 MR. POOLE: Yes. I tried to get engineering to do several
213 ways. I did a project a long time ago that we grade -- it's called a
214 grading where we tried to do a foundation -- well, we did a
215 foundation was put, caisson footings, but the footings for this
216 addition would be right on top of the roots. And I was an arborist
217 so for my comfort putting a caisson and a footing that close to a
218 tree would eventually kill the tree and endanger the home.

219 But I was no landscape architect but when that tree goes,
220 I'm going to landscape. That's my plan. I'm waiting on -- that's
221 why, I haven't seen winter by my house. And I haven't seen any
222 trees. I'm waiting on doing the construction site landscape,
223 landscape everything and do some drainage. I'm planning on
224 eventually digging the back little flat area up and put a french
225 drain in into a pit where I can save the ground water eventually.

226 MR. KRASNER: That's a question for Mr. Boyle. Considering
227 we approve the Variance upon the plat, the grading plan or the
228 building permit, the City arborist I imagine will take a look at
229 this, just to insure that any placement that's required under the
230 Code, I'm not sure what would be required to replace the existing
231 canopy of those other trees but is that something the City arborist

232 would confirm at the time of the building permit?

233 MR. BOYLE: Yes. I think they only do that review if a
234 grade plan is required, however the arborist is going to see these
235 building permits and would have an opinion about whether that tree
236 should come down or not.

237 MR. KRASNER: Just looking at it where it is on the
238 picture, I don't have the scale on the photo but it looks like, you
239 get that close to the roots down there --

240 MR. BOYLE: Is there a stake or something?

241 MR. POOLE: Yeah, in picture number two, you can see the
242 little stakes right beside the maple and the front one, it's well
243 outside the line.

244 MR. KRASNER: Glad to hear you're concerned about the
245 replacement of that because it is providing some shade now.

246 MR. POOLE: Well, if you look at the lawn, I'm trying to
247 grow a moss lawn and I need shade. Not just on two fronts. I love
248 trees, so I have a bunch of trees and shrubs and too I need shade to
249 grow that nice, beautiful moss lawn with some stone.

250 MR. KRASNER: I don't have any more questions for you.

251 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Any other questions for the applicant?

252 (No response.)

253 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: It didn't look like anyone from the
254 audience is going to speak on this.

255 Am I correct on that?

256 (No response.)

257 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Any final comments you'd like to make
258 before we close this and have discussion amongst the Board?

259 MR. POOLE: No. I'd just like to thank the Board for
260 taking the time for me to speak this evening. I know it's late and I
261 thank you for taking the time. Thank you very much for your
262 consideration.

263 CHAIRMAN WILLIAMSON: Okay. We'll close it to the audience
264 and the applicant.

265 And I guess open it to the Board for discussion and a
266 motion.

267 MR. HOWELL: First of all, congratulations on presenting a
268 very detailed proposal. They arrive in various forms and this makes
269 it very clear what you're planning to do, especially the plans for
270 the tree and other aspects of the property.

271 From the pictures and the plat I understand it's not really
272 feasible to go backwards. This is the only direction in which you
273 could move. So I'm inclined to say that we should grant this

274 Variance.

275 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Any other comments?

276 (No response.)

277 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. Then is there a motion for this
278 Variance?

279 MR. KRASNER: I'll make a motion. And again, first of all
280 I'll make a motion and make some comments for the record.

281 In the Application V-1581-16 by Corey Joseph Poole, for a
282 Variance to a front yard setback of 21.4 feet instead of 30 feet
283 along the entry frontage, property known as 605 Jackson Street, RPC
284 #52-601-016 of the Falls Church Real Property Records, I'm going to
285 move that we approve the Variance. I think the applicant has
286 presented testimony that satisfies the criteria in Chapter 50.2 of
287 State Code for Variances.

288 I think he's shown that, one, there's, practically
289 speaking, a hardship on this property due to the relatively severe
290 grade in the rear yard, and I think it would be, as Mr. Howell said,
291 practically speaking, it would be difficult to build it on the former
292 location without significant cutting of the slope so the entry
293 frontage is the most logical place for this addition.

294 It's a relative modest addition, it appears to be in

295 character. Like I said, I visited the neighborhood, it appears to be
296 in character with the homes around it on Jackson Street and Ann
297 Street and I think overall it will fit in well. I don't see it
298 causing any detriment or harm to anyone in that immediate vicinity.

299 The house across the street on Ann Street fronts on Jackson
300 and is well away from it and there's some large hedges there. The
301 house behind on Ann Street is also well behind. And the ones across,
302 again, I think again it's not going to cause any harm there. I
303 believe they were included in the list of people who supported it in
304 those letters of support.

305 For those reasons, I feel that it meets the intended Zoning
306 Ordinance and is in harmony with the Comprehensive Plan and for that
307 reason I move that we approve the request.

308 CHAIRMAN WILLIAMSON: Okay. There's a motion with some
309 supporting comments.

310 Is there a second?

311 MR. HOWELL: I second.

312 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. Roll call vote, please.

313 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Theologis.

314 MR. THEOLOGIS: Yes.

315 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Jones.

316 MR. JONES: Yes.

317 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Howell.

318 MR. HOWELL: Yes.

319 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Krasner.

320 MR. KRASNER: Yes.

321 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Williamson.

322 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Yes.

323 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Congratulations. You have your
324 Variance. Good luck with the project.

325 MR. POOLE: Thank you so much.

326

327 b. Variance application V1580-16 by Pizzeria Orso, for a
328 variance to Section 48-1265(2)(b) to allow placement of a projecting
329 sign above the lower sill line of the second floor windows, on
330 premises known as 400 South Maple Avenue, RPC #52-309-416 of the
331 Falls Church Real Property records, zoned B-3, General Business.

332 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. Moving on to the next order of
333 New Business is Variance Application V1580-16 by Pizzeria Orso, for a
334 variance to Section 48-1265(2)(b) to allow placement of a projecting
335 sign above the lower sill line of the second floor windows, on
336 premises known as 400 South Maple Avenue, RPC #52-309-416 of the

337 Falls Church Real Property records, zoned B-3, General Business.

338 I don't think you were sworn in earlier.

339 MR. LAYDEN: No.

340 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. Raise your right hand and repeat
341 after me.

342 (Witness sworn.)

343 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: We're getting the presentation set up
344 here.

345 Can all the Board members see that?

346 MR. KRASNER: Yeah.

347 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: If you'll sign in please,

348 MR. LAYDEN: Sure.

349 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. Before we get started and hear
350 from the applicant, if we can just get a brief report from staff on
351 this.

352 MR. BOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

353 This matter went to -- first let me say, the sign being
354 requested is coming before you for a Variance because of its intended
355 location on the building.

356 You've seen quite a few Variance applications for signs
357 lately and this is one that is similar to others you've had in the

358 past basically where something in the building or landscaping or what
359 have you precludes placement in a normal location.

360 This one is before the Board tonight because staff does not
361 have authority to approve a sign of this nature above the bottom of a
362 second story sill. And I think you'll hear from the applicant
363 tonight about what the particular problems are with that in this
364 location.

365 When sign variances are applied for, they first go to the
366 Architectural Advisory Board and this one did on May 4th. The
367 Architectural Advisory Board does its minutes in kind of a summary
368 form so you have a document that kind of looks like their agenda for
369 that evening for May 4th and then they'll add kind of summary minutes
370 within the document.

371 So this serves as their recommendation to the Board. And
372 under their New Business Item, No. 6 A, the Variance Application,
373 they do make a recommendation not to approve this and they list their
374 reasons there.

375 The Code does have these items go to the Architectural
376 Advisory Board first for their recommendation and that's for this
377 Board then to consider in the questions it asks the applicant tonight
378 in framing your decision.

379 I will say that the applicant points out that a recent Code
380 change did allow for how wall signs are positioned on buildings and
381 it's likely that the Variance they're asking for probably will be in
382 a future Code amendment and become a by-right item. However, at this
383 time the Code requires a Variance for placement as they're requesting
384 it.

385 So I'll offer that just as, I think there's been
386 conversation from Council, Planning Commission, and the Architectural
387 Advisory Board that our Sign Code also needs some updating,
388 especially with the size of the buildings we're getting now. The
389 Sign Code I think went through a major overhaul in the late 1980s
390 which predates all except perhaps 803 West Broad, predates any of the
391 tall buildings in town, so we're seeing more and more of these
392 applications for placement and size of signs.

393 And so with that, I'll defer to the applicant's
394 presentation.

395 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: All right. Before you do, Mr. Boyle,
396 two questions. Did I hear you correctly that this kind of sign,
397 staff could approve if it was one level below, did I understand that
398 correctly?

399 MR. BOYLE: Correct.

400 The language at issue here in Chapter 48, 48 12-65(2) (b),
401 location for projecting signs, one is permitted for each ground floor
402 business as they are, and then location, it covers a single story but
403 then it goes on: For a multi-story building, no projecting sign
404 shall extend above the lower sill line of the second floor windows.
405 And then there's some additional language. So it's pretty
406 straightforward.

407 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: All right. Any questions for staff
408 before we proceed?

409 MR. HOWELL: I just wanted to clarify the recommendation
410 given. I having some difficulty understanding about the tree line
411 and what people should have and so on.

412 Can you sort of explain this recommendation, 6 A, from the
413 Architectural Advisory Board?

414 MR. BOYLE: If you'd like, I'll read it into the record and
415 then we'll have a conversation from there.

416 MR. HOWELL: Okay.

417 MR. BOYLE: On May 4, 2016, the Architectural Advisory
418 Board heard this matter for the purpose of making a recommendation to
419 the Board of Zoning Appeals and it was heard under New Business, Item
420 6 A.

421 In their discussion, the Board heard from the applicant,
422 discussed the hardships of the retail establishment location, the
423 merits of the design of the sign and the concept behind it and
424 concerns with respect to the high placement of the sign and the
425 obstruction of viewing the sign, despite the high mounting position
426 due to street-side trees.

427 Following, the discussion, Mr. Way made a motion to
428 recommend that the Board of Zoning Appeals, to deny the Variance due
429 to the fact that, a, the proposed sign location may not accomplish
430 the goal of the enhanced visibility for the business due to the
431 existing streetscape trees, and, b, the acceptance of this Variance
432 will open the potential for many other businesses facing the same
433 location situation, to apply for similar Variances resulting in an
434 unattractive view from both vehicular, pedestrian traffic.

435 The Board suggests the City explore alternatives to address
436 this issue, including alteration of streetscaping strategy,
437 especially with respect to the trees including limbing up or consider
438 alternative solutions to prevent or post additional signage for
439 businesses in similar situations, including City funded and
440 maintained sign posts or light post banners.

441 Mr. Anderson seconded it and the motion passed unanimously.

442 What I take from them, I was not present at that meeting
443 but I see this language from the Board on other recommendations they
444 make, and they spend a great deal of time considering the aesthetics
445 of an approval: Does it work with the architecture? So less of a
446 hardship.

447 A big piece of that Board's consideration is what's the fit
448 and finish versus the architecture. Some members of that Board were
449 involved in the site plan approval for that building. It's a
450 relative new building. Some members of the AAB were active at the
451 time that building was approved.

452 So when they consider an item, they will consider not just
453 the hardship aspect but architectural and aesthetics. They're taking
454 the position that, what I read their conversation is that perhaps it
455 could be resolved in another manner and that the requested simple
456 elevation may not actually get them the solution.

457 They do have concerns with the streetscapes that we have.
458 They see that on all the site plans and I think the AAB's voiced
459 concerns in the past that it creates an issue for a decade or more
460 until these trees are mature, so a decision needs to be made whether
461 the City's going to continue with these streetscapes or revise them.

462 They don't think waiting for the trees to be trimmed from

463 below, limbing them up or maturing, is going to solve this problem.

464 And they have found for the most part that the streetscape we have is
465 an attractive one.

466 So there is a dilemma, this is the streetscape the City is
467 going to be installing throughout the City, and so simply raising the
468 signs, the trees will continue to grow and the problem will reoccur
469 in the future.

470 I think the interesting piece of that may be simply, is
471 there an alternative to what's being proposed. That's more in the
472 realm of what this Board hears as opposed to the aesthetics that the
473 AAB stressed.

474 In considering what the AAB intended in their motion,
475 beyond that they recommended denial, is: Is there another location
476 for this sign or is there another solution. It doesn't sound to me
477 that they were confident that this was going to solve the problem.

478 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Thank you, Mr. Boyle.

479 Why don't we hear from the applicant on that and other
480 matters at this point in time.

481 Could you state your name and address and proceed.

482 MR. LAYDEN: Sure. Joe Layden from Pizzeria Orso, 400
483 South Maple Avenue.

484 Thank you for letting me present this here tonight. We're
485 a six year old Neapolitan restaurant. We've been at that location
486 the entire six years.

487 Something that we've always struggled with is our
488 visibility and part of reason that we struggle with this are the
489 street trees and the streetscape and, you know, we're at the bottom
490 of an office building. We do have two wall signs and then we saw the
491 opportunity to get a projecting sign.

492 And I think a projecting sign and having it a bit higher
493 than the street trees would help to gain or help improve our
494 visibility.

495 And when I saw that the wall signs were now about to go up
496 to essentially the third floor window line, I thought projecting
497 signs should be able to go there as well. They weren't and so that's
498 how we end up here, looking for a Variance.

499 During the architectural appropriateness Board review,
500 aesthetically they loved the sign. They were just convinced that
501 anywhere on the building it wouldn't be seen unless it was at the top
502 because of the street trees.

503 This was based on them looking at a Google street view from
504 2012, which, keep in mind, has a camera 8 feet in the air and it's

505 traveling in the wrong lane of traffic.

506 So I went out and photographed from inside my car going
507 both directions on Maple and I just wanted to show you that and show
508 you how the project is affected by the street trees and how a
509 projecting sign at the same height as a wall sign would improve our
510 visibility.

511 So this is down near the comic store headed up towards the
512 property. That's the property right there. Obviously we're
513 extremely far away and you wouldn't see any sign from this point. I
514 just wanted to give you some perspective. It's too far away.

515 Right around here, it's hard to see but right there, I
516 think you would begin to see that sign. At night when it's lit up,
517 you can definitely see it. What you can't see is anything below
518 there as it's all street trees.

519 Here you can see the sign again and you can certainly see
520 the restaurant but not my sign because of the streetscape. Here, you
521 can already start to see the sign, and then there's our existing sign
522 and there's the corner of the building.

523 At this point you're driving and you see the sign and know
524 that you take a left at the stop sign and not go forward or whatever.

525 And here we are pretty much coming up on the stop sign.

526 There's the projecting sign and then right here is our wall sign. At
527 this point you can see the wall sign. Also notice, because you are
528 in line with the sign, it's hard to read. If you were directly in
529 front of the building, obviously it would read a lot better.

530 The projecting sign you can no longer read if you are in
531 that direction.

532 And then all the way up the stop sign you can clearly see,
533 and this is a small sign. It's about 6 feet tall, less than two feet
534 wide. And our other wall sign for perspective.

535 This is coming the opposite direction towards the
536 restaurant. Right there you're too far away, you really wouldn't see
537 anything.

538 About here is -- the color is kind of off, you can't really
539 see our wall sign. I think you'd start to see the projecting sign.
540 Here again, you start to see the little sign, our existing sign.

541 There it is again, that's the third floor window.

542 By right, this location here is where the projecting sign
543 would go. And that's why we've asked to have it higher because I
544 don't think this really does anything more for us than what we have
545 existing.

546 And here we are, pretty much in front of the restaurant.

547 Something I didn't mention in the application is how cars
548 parked here also affect our visibility. You can't see them from the
549 road, can't see the awnings, so hopefully you see the sign, you take
550 a right, stop sign to pull into the parking garage.

551 You know, something else that was talked about at the
552 architectural appropriateness meeting was the signs elsewhere in the
553 City, and I just wanted to point out, West Broad, and what Mr. Boyle
554 was talking about these newer developments, West Broad has a very
555 large projecting sign that starts at the third floor window line and
556 goes up two stories.

557 And now I also wanted to point out, this is the Mason Row
558 project which also right here has a large projecting sign. Here it
559 is again, you can see the big hotel sign. It looks like it starts on
560 the fourth floor and goes up to the sixth floor.

561 This project, it's early on, but it also has a projecting
562 sign. And I think one of the newest projects, this place, they also
563 have a projecting sign. So I don't really think what we're asking
564 for is that far out of line.

565 And that's it. Thank you.

566 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. Thank you.

567 Do members of the Board have questions for the applicant?

568 Yes, please.

569 MR. HOWELL: I just want to make clear, you've got an
570 existing sign that you showed us in the picture there and that's the
571 one that appears on one of the drawings that we have there.

572 MR. LAYDEN: Yes.

573 MR. HOWELL: This one. This is the existing sign.

574 MR. LAYDEN: Yes.

575 MR. HOWELL: Can you just sort of compare for us the
576 existing scale, the height and the scale of the existing sign
577 compared to the one you're asking a Variance for.

578 MR. LAYDEN: I think our two wall signs combined are 50
579 square feet or something.

580 MR. HOWELL: No, just the projecting sign.

581 MR. LAYDEN: Oh, that sign. It's ten feet, the area.

582 MR. HOWELL: The new one.

583 MR. LAYDEN: Yeah.

584 MR. HOWELL: And the existing one is what?

585 MR. LAYDEN: Combined, 50.

586 MR. HOWELL: I'm just trying to get the --

587 MR. LAYDEN: This wall sign?

588 MR. HOWELL: No, that one.

589 MR. LAYDEN: Yeah, that's 10.

590 MR. HOWELL: What I'd like to know is what the size and
591 height of that is and what the size and heights of the one for which
592 you're seeking the Variance is.

593 MR. KRASNER: That's proposed.

594 MR. LAYDEN: That is what I'm trying, yeah.

595 MR. HOWELL: That's proposed, that one?

596 MR. LAYDEN: Yeah.

597 MR. HOWELL: That one is not actually there right now.

598 MR. LAYDEN: No.

599 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: He hopes it is.

600 MR. LAYDEN: It could be.

601 MR. HOWELL: There isn't a projecting sign there at all
602 now?

603 MR. LAYDEN: No.

604 MR. HOWELL: Understood. Thank you.

605 MR. BOYLE: The sign contractors do a fantastic job
606 inserting these images.

607 MR. LAYDEN: I did it myself.

608 MR. BOYLE: And the applicants too.

609 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. Are there other questions for the

610 applicant?

611 MR. KRASNER: Yes. The question I have, right across the
612 street now, that's a residential project.

613 MR. BOYLE: Tinner Hill. Lincoln and Tinner Hill.

614 MR. KRASNER: Right. I think it's more of a comment than a
615 question. The one concern that I have, it's going to be illuminated
616 at night, at that height and Washington Street there is -- I'm sorry,
617 not Washington Street, Maple is there. So there's angles each side.
618 We're on larger, wider roadways. And so residents across the street
619 potentially have a sign that's lit at night, streaming into their
620 windows. And I don't know if there's quite a precedent for that in
621 the City. That's my one concern.

622 Do you have any opinion on that issue?

623 MR. LAYDEN: Well, yeah. I mean, it's a business sign,
624 it's an LED. It's not a bright neon sign. It's not something --
625 it's no brighter than a street light, I'll put it that way.

626 Those street lights throw off a lot more light than this
627 projecting signs ever would.

628 MR. KRASNER: Would you be shutting this off at some time,
629 after business hours?

630 MR. LAYDEN: Yeah. That would be like our signage lights,

631 they would go off.

632 MR. KRASNER: What time do you close? What time would
633 those go off?

634 MR. LAYDEN: Oh, probably at 11.

635 MR. KRASNER: So you'd be agreeable to a condition that
636 would require that sign to go off at 11 p.m.?

637 MR. LAYDEN: Yeah.

638 MR. KRASNER: Okay.

639 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Other questions?

640 MR. HOWELL: Yeah. What happens in those second or third
641 floor, especially the third floor, windows? Are those occupied
642 during the day?

643 MR. LAYDEN: It's an office.

644 MR. HOWELL: Thank you.

645 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: And you have the support of the building
646 to put that up?

647 MR. LAYDEN: Yes.

648 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. All right. Are there other
649 questions for the applicant?

650 Yes.

651 MR. THEOLOGIS: So you wish to improve the visibility. Is

652 that primarily to attract new customers that are not familiar with
653 the location of the restaurant?

654 MR. LAYDEN: Yes. And also maybe helping different
655 customers to find the location. To turn left at the stop sign
656 because they see us and not drive by and have to call and get
657 directions again.

658 MR. THEOLOGIS: And is there any data to support what
659 improvement you could see if that sign was there?

660 MR. LAYDEN: Not that I'm aware of.

661 MR. THEOLOGIS: And the last question, in a few years, if
662 the tree grows, then what do you propose? What would you do then?
663 If it grew enough to sort of --

664 MR. LAYDEN: To obscure it?

665 MR. THEOLOGIS: -- to obscure the sign.

666 MR. LAYDEN: At that point, maybe the trees won't obscure
667 wall signs. And won't obscure the windows as much.

668 Also, keep in mind, the project has a very low grade. It's
669 actually set below grade. Its northern point, you can see a
670 retaining wall here. So from here when you're on the street, to
671 here, is probably a six foot drop.

672 MR. KRASNER: Mr. Boyle, we measured, we measured the sill

673 line so the fact that the -- not the height and grade, but
674 essentially the effective height of the building compared to what's
675 across the street is actually lower, correct?

676 MR. BOYLE: Correct. The Sign Code references specifically
677 the sill line, but you're right, in this particular building it's
678 starting lower.

679 MR. KRASNER: So, what is your third story is probably
680 equal to the height of maybe the second story or at least close to
681 that on the Tinner project?

682 MR. BOYLE: At least a half, half story, yeah.

683 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: And that building will have a number of
684 signs as well.

685 MR. BOYLE: And if I could ask a question.

686 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Please, go ahead.

687 MR. BOYLE: The street trees are at grade and the building
688 is lower than the street trees, is that correct?

689 MR. LAYDEN: That's correct.

690 MR. KRASNER: Are there any other retail tenants in the Tax
691 building?

692 MR. LAYDEN: There's a dentist but that's really more of a
693 professional service.

694 MR. KRASNER: They don't have any steerage signage, other
695 than their name on the doors, any other steerage signage?

696 MR. BOYLE: Just minimal.

697 MR. LAYDEN: They have a wall sign. They actually might
698 have two wall signs, one that says Gentle Touch, and another that
699 says, Spa or Dental Spa.

700 MR. KRASNER: Are there any other retail spaces in that
701 building that are vacant now, or is it just you and the dentist?

702 MR. LAYDEN: It's just us and the dentist.

703 MR. KRASNER: There's no other retail space in there.

704 Okay.

705 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. Any other questions? Question
706 for staff?

707 First, any more questions for the applicant?

708 MR. JONES: I just have one small question. You mentioned
709 there's you and the dentist. Is there any other tenants in the
710 building?

711 MR. LAYDEN: Well, obviously Tax Analysts and on the second
712 floor it's Virginia Women's Health, it's a doctor. Clinic. And I'm
713 not sure about any other tenants. Those are the two major ones.

714 MR. JONES: Okay. Thank you.

715 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Any other questions for the applicant?

716 (No response.)

717 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Any questions for staff?

718 MR. JONES: Are you aware of the building across the
719 street, where they'd have signs or they will have signs.

720 MR. BOYLE: I don't believe they've come in with their sign
721 package yet.

722 MR. HOWELL: We heard something, they got some very high up
723 as I recall. On the corner.

724 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: It was the Fresh Market.

725 MR. BOYLE: Fresh Market, which raises a question. I'm not
726 recalling what they came in for, but it's consistent. I do recall
727 they asked for Variances for size and placement as well. It's
728 typical for what we're seeing with the new buildings.

729 MR. KRASNER: Is there retail space on the Tinner Hill
730 project on Maple?

731 MR. BOYLE: Yeah. They've proposed to have service and
732 retail. Service like a tax preparer, something like that. And
733 retail. I haven't seen the tenants. The only one we were certain
734 of until recently was the grocery store.

735 So there will be retail on that street.

736 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. Any other questions for staff?

737 MR. THEOLOGIS: I just want to clarify, you said there will
738 likely be signs that will be higher than the existing.

739 MR. Boyle: Yes, on the Tinner Hill building, yes.

740 MR. THEOLOGIS: And when is that expected to go live?

741 MR. BOYLE: I think by the end of this year. They were
742 delayed with some ground water and construction issues.

743 So, they've come in and started to ask for occupancy
744 permits for their leasing office, for their rentals, and we're
745 starting to get some retail fit-out for retail spaces, permits for
746 those. So, they're about four months behind, 301 West Broad, where
747 the Harris Teeter is.

748 The Harris Teeter has actually requested this week to begin
749 stocking the store. So these buildings were both under construction
750 at the same time that the Lincoln-Tinner Hill building fell a couple
751 of months behind.

752 By the end of the year, it should be essentially complete.

753 MR. THEOLOGIS: Would this sign be in line with the signs
754 across the street? Would it be about the same height and size?

755 MR. BOYLE: Actually, I think this one is very
756 conservative. I think it meets the area for a sign. Its only issue

757 is the placement on the building.

758 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. Would you like to make any final
759 comments before we discuss this amongst the Board?

760 (No response.)

761 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. So we'll close it to the
762 applicant, close any questions for staff and we'll discuss it amongst
763 the Board.

764 Any comments or is there a motion?

765 MR. KRASNER: I'll just make a comment. I mean, this is a
766 tough call, at least for me. I think Mr. Theologis kind of hit it on
767 the head to where I was thinking. He showed the trees, okay, they're
768 going to grow. The height that they're proposed, these species of
769 trees will, you know, not that many years from now be concealing that
770 sign.

771 So, I'm wondering really, the Variance criteria even for
772 that size would even achieve the objective here. And I think the
773 concern about setting precedent is valid along Maple. You know,
774 there are other retail spaces planned here, and they're not trying to
775 match, if there were a number of these, one in isolation perhaps, it
776 seems innocuous but if there were one on every building corner,
777 begins to change the character there.

778 And the point about Code change coming potentially, I mean
779 is another consideration. I know the City's Sign Code is out of date
780 and we've heard a lot of sign Variance requests here, typically for
781 higher signs and we've approved some. We haven't approved others.

782 But anyhow, I'm kind of conflicted. I can see the merits.
783 I certainly understand where the applicant's coming from, the desire
784 for visibility and Maple is a lower traffic street as opposed to
785 Washington. You're not as visible as perhaps other businesses are.
786 I mean I certainly understand that. But I guess I'm trying to see
787 how much is gained by this versus the potential downsides.

788 I'm going to vote for this but I can see it both ways.

789 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Other comments?

790 Go ahead please.

791 MR. HOWELL: I think the character of these buildings which
792 are now emerging, I can't remember the details but I do recall when
793 we were talking about Food Market, the name of it --

794 MR. BOYLE: Fresh Market.

795 MR. HOWELL: Fresh Market, I recall a discussion about a
796 sign that was fully five stories high, a big square one. I can't
797 remember what we decided and I can't remember exactly what the
798 details were. But it seems to me that these kinds of developments

799 mean that it's pretty helpful to people who are passing by or coming
800 down the street to know what kinds of things are available. We being
801 a low rise city and I understood Mr. Boyle to say that there was some
802 sense of looking at this in terms of the kinds of building
803 developments that are taking place in the City.

804 I think this is an attractive, relatively unobtrusive,
805 don't consider it's going to interfere with anybody's enjoyment; in
806 fact I think it's likely a public service to know where I should turn
807 when I come for my pizza.

808 I'm inclined, subject to what other colleagues think, to
809 feel that we should grant the Variance.

810 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Other comments?

811 MR. THEOLOGIS: I understand the desire to improve the
812 visibility and perceived benefit, I'm not convinced about the
813 hardship, that the hardship is such that it warrants a Variance at
814 this time.

815 And I'm also concerned about setting precedent, not only to
816 take signs up to the I guess below the third floor, but even if the
817 Code at some point is updated to allow for that, someone then can ask
818 for a Variance based on that we have a tall tree in front of us, we
819 want the sign to be higher.

820 So it's a more general precedent that we'd be setting. And
821 I'm not convinced that there is such a hardship here to set that.

822 Now, if the Code changes or we see across the street signs
823 going up where this sign would sort of be well in line with the
824 height and the position, then obviously it would fair for us to allow
825 the Variance at that time but I'm hesitant to do so at this time.

826 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: I think on that point we heard there
827 will be signs that are higher than the one being proposed. And that
828 the other thing that at least I'm moved by, the setup of the building
829 makes this basically third floor sign lower than, comparable, I don't
830 know if it's exactly comparable to the second floor on the building
831 next door but it certainly brings it much lower compared to the
832 other buildings on the street.

833 And if there are going to be other signs, I can actually
834 see where having a sign, that business will need such a sign because
835 there will be other competing things as we saw on the streetscape
836 that the applicant showed us. So I think I'm moved by those various
837 things.

838 Any other comments?

839 MR. JONES: Let me say one thing. I agree with Mr.
840 Theologis. I'm conflicted also. I'm concerned with the precedent.

841 I'm also concerned with sort of a sign arms race, if you will, where
842 the dental office might want to put one up also. So I'm just
843 concerned with those things. I think Mr. Theologis said it very
844 eloquently and I agree with his point.

845 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: You need to get the approval of the
846 building in order to request this, right?

847 MR. LAYDEN: Oh, yeah.

848 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: So if there's any competing signs,
849 competing signs would have to be vetted and approved by the building
850 first.

851 Okay. All right. Is there a motion?

852 MR. HOWELL: I make a motion to approve. As to Item 6 b,
853 that the Variance Application V1580-16 by Pizzeria Orso, for a
854 Variance to Section 48-1265(2)(b) to allow placement of a projecting
855 sign above the lower sill line of the second floor windows on
856 premises known as 400 South Maple Avenue, RPC #52-309-416 of the
857 Falls Church Real Property records, zoned B-3, General Business, that
858 the Variance application should be granted.

859 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Is there a second?

860 MR. KRASNER: I'll second it for discussion.

861 Well, again as I said earlier on, I'm still kind of

862 conflicted. I think I've heard some good points on both sides. If
863 we're going to support this, I think I definitely want to see a
864 condition to require the light be shut off at 11 p.m. to make sure
865 that it's not shining at the building across the street at late
866 hours.

867 I don't know if there are any other -- I mean, that's
868 probably the biggest concern I have as far as condition would go.

869 I still think that again, begins to set a precedent. I
870 know the City is contemplating updates to the Sign Code. But again,
871 perhaps doing it through the Variance is not the most efficient way
872 to get -- signage comprehensively, the ideal setup, the building
873 signage is appointed comprehensively and not one off one at a time.

874 Same thing goes for a corridor like this on Maple. I'm
875 concerned about signage being consistent with whatever gets approved
876 by the City, when they do update the Code.

877 I know Mr. Boyle mentioned signage across the street but
878 there's no projecting signage across the street at this height,
879 otherwise they would have had to come here for a Variance. Correct?

880 MR. BOYLE: I'm not recalling what they applied for. I'd
881 have to research that.

882 MR. KRASNER: It's a close call. It's a close call. I

883 don't know if any of my colleagues have anything else to add.

884 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Mr. Howell, would you accept the
885 condition to your motion that the sign be turned off at 11 p.m.
886 nightly?

887 MR. HOWELL: Yes, if that were acceptable to the company, I
888 would certainly accept that condition as part of the -- as a
889 condition of our approval.

890 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: We heard that was acceptable.

891 MR. LAYDEN: Acceptable, yes.

892 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay.

893 MR. KRASNER: Another -- I don't know if we need to do this
894 by condition, another thing I'm concerned about is the proliferation
895 of signage. I'd want to limit the number of projecting signs on this
896 building to one. I wouldn't want to see any other projecting signs
897 on this building.

898 So I'd want to put a limit, another condition that only one
899 projecting sign is allowed on this building as another condition. I
900 believe we can do that. I'm pretty sure we can, we can limit the
901 number.

902 So I would limit it to one as a condition of this approval.
903 So if another tenant here wants one, they essentially can't unless

904 they make a deal with them at some point in the future. That's my
905 other big concern, the proliferation of signage.

906 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: By that, are you referring to a sign
907 that a third -- like above the second floor sill?

908 MR. KRASNER: Right.

909 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: So anything that would require -- you'd
910 be limiting any additional -- no additional signs would require such
911 a Variance.

912 MR. KRASNER: Right. So if in the future some other tenant
913 wanted it and decided to apply, they'd be in conflict with this
914 approval, so they'd have to pick one or the other.

915 So, right, there will be a second condition that the Tax
916 Analyst building be limited to one non-conforming projecting sign.

917 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Mr. Howell, will you accept such a --

918 MR. HOWELL: I'm having a little difficulty with it because
919 the tenant who's applying, can we really put that kind of constraint
920 on the building itself at this point? I'd be a little uneasy about
921 that but if it helps us reach a positive conclusion, then I would
922 certainly accept it.

923 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. We'll consider this motion with
924 those two amendments to it. And you second it.

925 MR. KRASNER: Right. So he accepts that, my amendments to
926 the motion be accepted.

927 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: It will be seconded.

928 Mr. Boyle.

929 MR. BOYLE: If I could clarify, the condition is not to
930 prohibit any future projecting signs but any future --

931 MR. KRASNER: Projecting signs above the second floor.

932 MR. BOYLE: That need a Variance.

933 MR. KRASNER: -- second floor sill, yeah.

934 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. Well, then is there a roll call
935 vote?

936 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Krasner.

937 MR. KRASNER: Yes.

938 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Howell.

939 MR. HOWELL: Yes.

940 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Jones.

941 MR. JONES: No.

942 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Theologis.

943 MR. THEOLOGIS: No.

944 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Williamson.

945 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Yes.

946 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Congratulations.

947 MR. LAYDEN: Thank you.

948 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: You have your sign. Good luck with your
949 project.

950 MR. LAYDEN: Thank you so much.

951

952 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

953 a. Approval of the March 17, 2016, meeting minutes

954

955 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. Then we can move onto the rest of
956 the Agenda, which is the approval of minutes from March 17, 2016.

957 (Minutes reviewed.)

958 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Seeing none, is there a motion to
959 approve the minutes of March 17th?

960 MR. KRASNER: I move we approve the minutes of March 17,
961 2016.

962 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Is there a second?

963 MR. THEOLOGIS: Second.

964 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Roll call vote.

965 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Williamson.

966 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Yes.

967 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Krasner.

968 MR. KRASNER: Yes.

969 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Howell.

970 MR. HOWELL: Yes.

971 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Jones.

972 MR. JONES: Since I wasn't here for this, do I need to --

973 MR. KRASNER: You abstain.

974 MR. JONES: Abstain, yes.

975 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Theologis.

976 MR. THEOLOGIS: Yes.

977

978 b. Approval of the April 14, 2016, Minutes

979

980 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Minutes of April 14, 2016, any edits to

981 these?

982 (Minutes reviewed.)

983 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Any changes to these minutes?

984 (No response.)

985 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Is there a motion to approve the minutes

986 from April 14, 2016?

987 MR. HOWELL: I move.

988 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Is there a second?

989 MR. THEOLOGIS: Second.

990 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Roll call vote.

991 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Theologis.

992 MR. THEOLOGIS: Yes.

993 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Jones.

994 MR. JONES: Abstain.

995 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Howell.

996 MR. HOWELL: Yes.

997 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Krasner.

998 MR. KRASNER: Yes.

999 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Williamson.

1000 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Yes.

1001

1002 c. Approval of resolution for special use permit

1003 application U1572-15

1004 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: And now we have before us Resolution to

1005 approve for Application V-1572-15, Site Link Wireless Variance

1006 application.

1007 Any edits to this resolution?

1008 MR. KRASNER: Typically we do the resolutions by -- have we

1009 been voting on these? I don't recall.

1010 MR. BOYLE: Over the years we've tried to get these to the
1011 Board and because of the delay with this meeting, we decided to bring
1012 these to you.

1013 Staff generally does a verbatim based on the recordings of
1014 the minutes, but we thought you'd like to see at least how these
1015 things are produced.

1016 MR. KRASNER: All right. Do we need to vote on this?

1017 MR. BOYLE: It's within your purview. I think this Agenda
1018 Item has always been -- we're just calling it approval of minutes
1019 now. If you're content with the content, we'll issue these.

1020 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: We're not required to begin approving
1021 these. I think we'll just review it and see if anybody has any
1022 edits.

1023 MR. BOYLE: That's actually a good take on it, rather than
1024 make a motion on it, see if you see any anomalies.

1025 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Any edits?

1026

1027 d. Approval of Resolution for Special Use Permit application

1028 ●CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Seeing none on

1029 U1572, what about U-7596?

1030 MR. KRASNER: Looks fine to me.

1031 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Good.

1032

1033 4. OLD BUSINESS

1034 a. Approval of the amended 2015 Annual Report

1035 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Next item is the approval of the amended

1036 2015 report. You guys have that in your packets. You can see the

1037 mark up and then the revised one that I will submit to the City

1038 Council. Actually it would be submitted from Mr. Krasner and myself.

1039 MR. KRASNER: I agree this is both good, and I want to

1040 thank the chair for compiling the data and I think it's a good

1041 summary of our activity.

1042 MR. HOWELL: I agree.

1043 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: I thank the vice-chair for his help with

1044 that and staff for their help with it too.

1045

1046 7. OTHER BUSINESS (informational items)

1047 a. Planning Commission Five Year Review

1048 b. Planning Commission Annual Report

1049 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Other Business, Item 7, informational

1050 items.

1051 Mr. Boyle.

1052 MR. BOYLE: Yes, Mr. Chair. You have the annual report and
1053 a five year report from the Planning commission. The Planning
1054 Commission does a five year review, this is a FYI of what they've
1055 been up to and how they approach their annual report, just for this
1056 Board's consideration.

1057 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Okay. Thank you for the information.
1058 We will review it.

1059 Any other comments?

1060 MR. KRASNER: Anything maybe on the horizon for July, are
1061 we going to have a meeting?

1062 MR. BOYLE: Yes, I think there's going to be a residential
1063 Variance.

1064 MR. KRASNER: The day we have for the July date?

1065 MR. BOYLE: The July meeting is July 14th.

1066 MR. KRASNER: I'll be here.

1067

1068 8. ADJOURNMENT

1069 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Is there a motion to adjourn?

1070 MR. KRASNER: So moved.

1071 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Is there a second?

1072 MR. HOWELL: I second.

1073 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Roll call vote.

1074 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Williamson.

1075 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: Yes.

1076 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Krasner.

1077 MR. KRASNER: Yes.

1078 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Howell.

1079 MR. HOWELL: Yes.

1080 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Jones.

1081 MR. JONES: Yes.

1082 MR. BOYLE: Mr. Theologis.

1083 MR. THEOLOGIS: Yes.

1084

1085 CHAIR WILLIAMSON: All right. This meeting is adjourned.

1086